

a 10,000-pound satellite that had malfunctioned. They were to grab this satellite in outer space and hold it with an arm they had constructed. They were going to repair this satellite—it had never been done before—traveling 16,000 miles an hour in weightlessness while trying to grab a 10,000-pound satellite.

Rick and his two colleagues went out. Something stuck on the apparatus, and they failed to grab the satellite. Do you know what the headlines were that night? The headlines were that "NASA Failed." "The Astronauts Failed." "The Mission Failed."

The next day, still orbiting in space, they tried again. They spent a couple of hours walking in space, trying to manipulate and maneuver to grab that satellite, and they failed again. And the second day the newspapers said, "NASA Mission Fails." "Astronauts Fail."

Then they spent some time trying to figure out how they could fix this problem, and they spent a day doing that. The next day, they went back out for a third time, and that is when many of us watched them on live television, I think, for about 4 hours, as they orbited around the Earth working this mechanism to grab the Intel satellite and fix the satellite. And they did it.

What they did was something that they had never before rehearsed, they had never planned and they had never done before. But they went out a third time and risked failure because they wanted to succeed.

Rick came to my office some time later. I asked how tough it was to try to do something in space that they had never even practiced. He said, "The shame would have been not to try." There is no shame in trying and failing. The shame is in failing to try, and they went out and failed twice and the world heard that they had failed. The third time they went out and did something no one expected they could do, and they succeeded.

It is not just astronauts in space with the courage and bravery of Rick Hieb and his colleagues who ought to understand the message that the shame is if you fail to try.

Last year, we did not get a budget agreement. The fact is, we ought not quit, we ought to try again. Now is the time for us to try to reach a budget agreement.

We have a circumstance in which the majority leader is running for President. The President is running for reelection. We have a very unique political circumstance in this country. It will probably make it a little difficult to deal with the budget issue. But that does not mean we should not continue to try. It is time to restart the budget negotiations, and it is time for us to succeed in developing a plan for a balanced budget in the interest of this country.

Mr. President, let me ask unanimous consent to proceed for as much time as I consume in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I was speaking about the negotiations to try to reach some kind of a balanced budget plan. I know there has been a lot of windmilling of the arms and gnashing of the teeth and wringing of the hands. There has been a lot of huffing and puffing on both sides of the aisle about the budget deficit and about who is at fault for not reaching a plan of some type to deal with the budget deficit. But the plain fact is, both sides, it seems to me, have something to contribute.

I have said on the floor that the Republicans, I think, need to be commended. The Republicans have said to us, this is something we must do. They have continued to apply pressure that we reach some kind of a solution. That, I think, serves this country's interests. The Democrats also serve this country's interests by saying, yes, let us do that, but let us do it the right way. Just doing it, if you do it the wrong way, can be terribly destructive to this country.

The choices on spending, which is what we are really talking about when we balance the budget, are critically important. Some came to the floor of the Senate and said, "We have a deal for you. Let us cut Star Schools by 40 percent and let us increase spending on star wars by 100 percent."

I do not know what air they breathe, but that does not seem like very clear thinking to me. So the method by which we balance the budget is critically important. How many people do you want to kick out of the Head Start Program? That is a program that really works and helps children. How many kids do you want to tell, "You no longer have an entitlement to have a hot lunch at school. You come from a poor family, but we decide you have no longer an entitlement to have a hot lunch at school in the middle of the day." How many people want to tell poor children that in this country? Some do, because that has been the proposal.

My point is, we should balance the budget, but we should do it with the right priorities. But, most of all, I think it is time for the President and the Members of the Congress to understand now is the time to try again. If we simply take the lower of the figures on spending cuts offered during this negotiations, the lower of the figures from either party, it adds up to over \$700 billion in spending cuts and adds up to the kind of spending cuts that will reach a balanced budget in the year 2002.

So, it is not a case of not having the will to get there. It is a case of not agreeing to the menu of the spending cuts. It is time to try again. It is time for the President and Members of Congress to sit down, restart the negotiations, and solve this problem.

As I said, before I relinquish the floor, we have a very unique cir-

cumstance facing us. We have a majority leader here in the Senate running for President. We have a President down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue who wants to keep his job. A lot of what is going to go on this year, I assume, will have a substantial amount of political overtones.

But there ought not be, it seems to me, a political judgment in this country that says balancing the budget is not important. It is important. It is the right thing to do, and it ought to be done the right way. I think the President and leaders of Congress have an obligation to restart these negotiations, restart them now, and continue budget negotiations until we finalize a plan and agree to a plan to reach a balanced budget. The American people deserve that and this country deserves that.

THE TRADE DEFICIT AND JOBS IN OUR COUNTRY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I want to just speak briefly about two issues. One is a jobs issue and the other is a crime issue. Both, I think, are important to this country. I introduced a bill on one subject last week, and I am going to introduce a bill on the other next week. I just talked about the budget deficit. That has been coming down some in recent years. It is still too high, but it has been coming down.

Nobody talks about the trade deficit. The trade deficit has been going up. Last year was a record. The fact is the trade deficit goes up because we are exporting manufacturing jobs out of this country. It means fewer jobs and fewer opportunities and less income for too many of the American people who need a good job with good income.

How do we deal with the jobs issue? I do not have all the answers. I know we have to deal with the trade deficit. Nobody here talks about it. The trade deficit is going to be repaid ultimately with a lower standard of living in this country. So we have to deal with that.

One thing we ought to do, just for starters, relates to a bill I introduced in the Senate last week. It is very simple. The bill simply says, let us stop providing tax loopholes or tax incentives for those people who move their plants and their jobs overseas. I bet there are not many people here who know that is what goes on in this country.

We have in our Tax Code in this country a provision that says, if you have a manufacturing plant in America, and you have 100 jobs or 1,000 jobs or 10,000 jobs in America, we will give you a deal, you close up that plant, fire those workers, move them overseas, and you get a tax break. You get a tax break.

You get two plants sitting side by side across the street from each other, and they make the same product, hire the same number of workers, and one of them closes up and moves overseas and the other one stays here. Guess

what the difference is? Our Tax Code says the one that moved overseas, you do not have to pay taxes to this country even though you manufacture the same product and ship it back to sell in Pittsburgh or Denver or Fargo. You do not have to pay taxes. The company in a State pays taxes out of its income, but you do not pay taxes out of your income because, as long as you move the company overseas, you can keep the income over there tax free until you are repatriated back. Most do not repatriate back, so they get a fat, juicy tax incentive for moving their plants overseas and closing their plants in this country.

It does not take smelling salts to get people clear-headed enough to understand that this is a fundamentally goofy provision in our tax law. If you cannot start with the first step in deciding that we are going to stop providing incentives for people to ship their jobs out of America and move their jobs overseas, then we do not have a ghost of a chance of solving our problem in this country with fewer jobs that pay well.

Why do I say that? People say there are more jobs in our country. Yes, there are more jobs. The fact is, there are also more people in our country, and the more jobs we are getting are not the kind of jobs that pay well. Too often they are service industry jobs that do not pay very well. Guess what kind of jobs are leaving? The manufacturing jobs that used to pay well with good benefits. What we need to do is shut the loophole that says move your jobs overseas and we will pay you to do it. Shut it and shut it immediately.

The piece of legislation I introduced last week, which I hope to have a number of votes on in the Congress, some hearings on, is very simple. There are two provisions in it. One says, shut the insidious loophole that says we will pay you if you move your jobs overseas. Just shut it down. End it. Just be done with it.

Second, you take the money from that, a little over \$2 billion, and you use it to provide tax credits for those who create new net jobs in our country. Those who create new jobs, more jobs now than they did over the previous couple-year base of their employment, they get a 25-percent tax credit on their payroll taxes, 25-percent tax credit for 2 years for the new jobs they create.

Let us use the savings by closing the loophole that exists to move jobs overseas and use those savings to provide an incentive to create jobs over here.

What could be more sensible than that? It is very simple: Yes or no, do we want to close the loophole that exists to send jobs overseas? Of course we do. We ought to. I had a vote here on the Senate last year and 52 Members voted to keep the loophole open. I will give them a chance to redeem themselves a couple of times this year. Should we close the loophole? Of course we should. Should we provide incentive to

keep jobs in this country? Of course we should.

This is a very simple proposition. This does not go into a big school to learn. This is not advanced math. You give people an incentive for moving their jobs, they will move them; provide people incentive to create jobs, you will have more jobs here.

Mr. President, S. 1597 is a piece of legislation—and I hope my colleagues will become acquainted with it because we will vote on it a number of times this year. I hope that enough colleagues will understand their constituents have an interest in it and will approve this. I would like to see one Member of the Senate go to one town meeting in one community in this country and stand up, and in the first sentence of the town meeting say, "By the way, I have a new idea. My idea is this: We should put in our Tax Code a little incentive that will reward companies who shut down their plants in America and move their jobs overseas." I think they would get booed out of the room before they get to the second sentence. That is what our Tax Code does. I am determined that we will shut that perverse, insidious incentive down, and we will do it soon.

That relates to the issue of jobs. Will that fix our jobs problem? No, but it will help. At least doctors understand to save the patient the first thing you do is stop the bleeding. That is what this bill is about.

CRIME

Mr. DORGAN. Now, the issue of crime. People want good jobs in our country. They also want to feel safe, and ours is a country with a serious crime challenge. I have a crime clock which shows the problem we have. One murder every 23 minutes; one forcible rape every 5 minutes; one robbery every 51 seconds; one aggravated assault every 28 seconds. We have 23,000 murders in America every year, and 110,000 rapes.

This is a country with a serious crime problem. I have said on the floor many times, and I want to repeat it, that it does not take Dick Tracy to understand who is going to commit the next violent crime. It is someone who committed a previous violent crime, and, in most cases, someone who has been in prison and who has been released early.

Earlier this week, I mentioned two recent cases, both of them in the Washington, DC, area. But I could stand up here and tell 3,400 similar stories, because 3,400 people have been murdered by people who should have been in prison and unable to murder anybody, but they were let out early. They were told that, since they behaved in prison, they would be let out early.

Here are two of these cases. One involves a young woman named Bettina Pruckmayr from Washington, DC, a young attorney, 26 years old, just starting her career here in Washington,

DC. She was allegedly abducted by a 38-year-old man named Leo Gonzales Wright on the evening of December 16. Mr. Wright abducted her and forced her to drive to an ATM machine. He has been linked to this crime through a bank security photo. He stabbed Bettina Pruckmayr, 38 times—7 times in the back, 3 times in the neck, and elsewhere in the body with sufficient force to break her bones. He killed her brutally.

Who is Leo Gonzales Wright, this man who allegedly killed Bettina Pruckmayr? This young attorney was killed by someone who should not have been able to kill an innocent person. He should have been in jail. He is a man who previously committed robbery, previously committed rape, previously committed murder, previously committed armed robbery. Despite rape, robbery, and murder, this man, at age 38, was walking around the streets of Washington, DC. In fact, after he was released early from prison, the police picked him up for selling drugs. But he was not put back in prison.

It does not take Sherlock Holmes to figure out who will commit the next crime. It is someone who should have been in prison, like this alleged killer—who had murdered before, robbed before, raped before—but who is walking the streets because someone in the criminal justice system said, "We want to let you out of prison early"—and did. The result is a 26-year-old young attorney named Bettina is dead. It should not have happened.

The second case involves a 13-year-old boy named Jonathan Hall, from Fairfax County, VA. I do not know much about Jonathan Hall except what I have heard on the news. Jonathan Hall was a young boy who was stabbed 58 times and thrown in a pond for dead. When they found him, they found grass and dirt between his fingers because he apparently, with 58 stab wounds, had tried to pull himself out of the pond. He was not dead when he was thrown into the pond, but he died.

The alleged killer of Jonathan is a fellow names James "Buck" Murray. James "Buck" Murray was sent to prison for murdering a cab driver a number of years ago. While he was in prison he was put on work release and he kidnapped a woman. Then, he murdered a fellow inmate. That is two murders and a kidnaping. And guess what? A few months ago he was walking the streets of Virginia, a free person, because the criminal justice system apparently felt it was OK that he could get out early. And now a 13-year-old boy is dead because a person who should have been in prison was walking the streets.

There are 3,400 other murder stories just like these. I have had some arguments with the folks in my State about the criminal justice system's approach to letting people out early. Here are the early release policies of some States, which I bet most people do not know. I will not go through and name